ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 08-004

1. PROJECT TITLE: **Harmony Cove Residential Condo and Marina Development**

Concurrent Entitlements:
General Plan Amendment No. 08-001
Zoning Map Amendment No. 08-001
Local Coastal Program Amendment No. 08-001
Conditional Use Permit No. 08-014
Coastal Development Permit No. 08-008
Variance No. 08-009
Design Review No. 08-047
Tentative Tract Map No. 17233

2. LEAD AGENCY:
City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Contact: Tess Nguyen, Associate Planner
Phone: (714) 374-1744
Email: tnguyen@surfcity-hb.org

3. PROJECT LOCATION:
3901 Warner Avenue (north side of Warner Avenue, west of Weatherly Lane)—formerly Percy Dock.

The project site is 2.28 acres, 1.02 acre of which is terra firma and 1.26 acres which is submerged (Huntington Harbour). The majority of the project site (1.91-acres) is owned by the property owner, BayviewHB LLC, and the remainder (0.37-acre) is owned by the California State Lands Commission.

4. PROJECT PROPONENT:
Michael C. Adams Associates, P.O. Box 382, Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Contact Person: Mike Adams
Phone: (714) 374-5678

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:
Land Portion - OS-P (Open Space-Park);
Water Portion - OS-W (Open Space-Water Recreation)

6. ZONING: Land Portion - RL-CZ-FP2 (Residential Low Density - Coastal Zone - Flood Plain 2);
Water Portion - OS-WR-CZ (Open Space-Water Recreation - Coastal Zone)

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is a request to amend the City's General Plan land use designation, Zoning map, and Local Coastal Program to amend the land use and zoning designations on the project site to allow for residential development and to permit the construction of 15 condominium units and a 25-boat slip marina. The project site is 2.28 acres, 1.02 acre of which is terra firma and 1.26 acres which is submerged. The majority of the project site (1.91-acres) is owned by the property owner, BayviewHB LLC, and the remainder (0.37-acre) is owned by the California State Lands Commission.

The residential project consists of three levels of housing over one level of subterranean parking and consists of eight two-bedroom, five three-bedroom, and two four-bedroom units ranging in size from 1,294 sq. ft. to 2,454 sq. ft. The proposed buildings will range from 35 feet to 40 feet high. The marina component consists of 15 private slips and 10 commercial slips; 19 boat slips are within the water portion of the property owned by the property owner and 6 boat slips are within the California State Lands Commission jurisdiction. The 15 private boat slips would be associated to the 15 residential units and the 10 commercial boat slips would be either sold or leased. A seven-foot wide public sidewalk will be constructed along the perimeter of the site, adjacent to the marina. The project proposes 43 subterranean parking spaces and 10 surface parking spaces. Access to the site is proposed via a new two-way driveway along Warner Avenue.

Preparation of the existing site to construct the project will entail construction of a vertical seawall to replace the revettment of rock riprap, dredging of the submerged area to allow construction of the marina, construction of retaining walls, installation of driven piles for floating docks, overexcavation of the land portion of the site, dewatering during excavation, and trenching for onsite utilities. Prior to initiating this work, the onsite paved parking area, related surface improvements, piles and floating dock will need to be demolished and removed from the site. The project will be constructed in different phases, starting with the construction of a new seawall and sidewalk, construction of the marina, then construction of the building foundation and support for the subterranean garage and residential units. The construction of the project will last approximately 36 months. The marina portion will take approximately 15 months and the residential portion will take approximately 21 months.

The project includes the following entitlements:

- General Plan Amendment—To amend the General Plan land use designation of the land portion of the site from OS-P (Open Space-Park) to RM-15 (Residential Medium Density—max 15 du/net acre).
- Zoning Map Amendment—To amend the zoning designation of the land portion of the site from RL-CZ-FP2 (Residential Low Density—Coastal Zone—Flood Plain 2) to RM-CZ-FP2 (Residential Medium Density—Coastal Zone—max 15 dwelling units/net acre—Flood Plain 2).
- Local Coastal Program Amendment—To amend the Local Coastal Program to reflect the proposed land use and zoning designations and to remove reference to the former Percy Dock.
- Conditional Use Permit—To permit the development of 15 condominium units with a 25-boat slip marina (15 private slips/10 commercial slips).
- Coastal Development Permit—To permit development of the residential project and associated infrastructure in the coastal zone, to review and "approve in concept" the boat slips/marina.
- Variance—To permit a building height of 40 ft. in lieu 35 ft.
- Design Review—To review the design, colors, and materials for a development of 15 condominium units with a 25-boat slip marina.

- Tentative Tract Map—To subdivide 1.91 acres of land and water area for 15 residential condominium units and 19 boat slips (15 private dockominium boat slips and 4 commercial boat slips). A 0.37 acre of water area immediately north of the project site will be leased from the State Lands Commission to expand the marina with an additional 6 commercial boat slips. The marina will have a total of 15 private boat slips and 10 commercial boat slips.

The property, formerly known as Percy Dock, was used as a public boat dock/parking facility operated by the City's Community Services Department from 1986 to 2002. This facility consisted of a 6-ft. long floating dock and 35-space parking lot. The land portion of the site was constructed to include 350 ft. of rip rap slope, 765 ft. of concrete curb and 24,465 sq. ft. of paving. The land portion of the site has not been in use since 2002. However, the onsite improvements remain and the site is fenced off. The water portion of the site is currently used as a waterway or open channel. Public and Marine Safety Division boats use the waterway to access docks to and from the Main Channel in Huntington Harbour.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

Single-family residences are located to the north (across the channel) and east of the subject property. The Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve-Outer Bolsa Bay is located across Warner Avenue to the south of the subject property. Fire Station No. 7, the Huntington Harbour Yacht Club, and multi-family residences are located to the west (across the channel) of the subject property.

The Huntington Harbour Main Channel surrounds the land portion of the subject site to the north and the west. The portion of the Main Channel to the west is used by the public as well as the City of Huntington Beach Marine Safety Division. The Warner Dock, a public dock, is used by the general public and the Yacht Club to secure and launch boats. The Marine Safety Division uses the dock to secure two to three rescue boats on a regular basis and gain access to the open waters for patrols and rescues. The portion of the Main Channel to the north is used by the public to access docks located to the east of the subject site.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: None.

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED)

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (404 Permit – Any Work Within Waters of the U.S.)
- California Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement)
- California State Lands Commission (Recreational Pier License, Lease of the Water Portion North of the Project Site for Marina Use)
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Harbor Permit, 404 Water Quality Certification, Deminimus De-Watering Permit)
- Clean Water Act Section 401 State Water Quality Certification or Waiver
- California Coastal Commission (Coastal Development Permit, Local Coastal Program Amendment)
- Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 Permit.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☑ Land Use / Planning	☐ Transportation / Traffic	☐ Public Services
☐ Population / Housing	☑ Biological Resources	☐ Utilities / Service Systems
☑ Geology / Soils	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Aesthetics
☑ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality	☑ Noise	☑ Recreation
☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☑

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or a "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required**. ☐

Tess Nguyen
Signature

April 14, 2010
Date

Tess Nguyen
Printed Name

Associate Planner
Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

   All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

2. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

3. "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

4. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

5. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.

6. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach's requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☑
Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 29)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Land Portion of the Site

The land portion of the project site is currently a vacant boat dock/parking facility. It has a General Plan designation of OS-P (Open Space-Park) and a zoning designation of RL-CZ-FP2 (Residential Low Density—Coastal Zone—Flood Plain 2), which is inconsistent with the General Plan. The uses permitted under the current land use designation include public parks and recreational facilities. The uses permitted under the current zoning designation include a range of residential uses and other public and semipublic uses.

Implementation of the proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment to amend the land use designation of the land portion of the site from OS-P (Open Space-Park) to RM (Residential Medium Density—max 15 du/net acre) and to establish a permitted density. A Zoning Map Amendment from RL-CZ-FP2 (Residential Low Density—Coastal Zone—Flood Plain 2) to RM-CZ-FP2 (Residential Medium Density—Coastal Zone—Flood Plain 2) would be required to establish the appropriate residential zoning designation for the land portion of the project site. A Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment would also be required to allow the proposed land use and zoning designations. These amendments represent a departure from the General Plan and LCP land uses currently allowed on the project site.

According to the California State Lands Commission, i.e. State, the project site is located in the survey of tidelands patented by the State as Tideland Location 221 (TLL 221). According to the State, there exists a Public Trust Easement over much of the areas patented pursuant to TLL 221. The Public Trust Easement over TLL 221 reserves the rights of the public to portions of said land for the purpose of access to navigable waters and to the rights of the public to fish therein and thereupon. Based on the above statement, the proposed residential use for the project site would be incompatible with the Public Trust Easement. Because of the incompatible use, there would be a potentially significant impact on land use. The applicant has provided a letter of intention to pursue a title settlement agreement with the California State Lands Commission in order to remove the Public Trust Easement over the project site and allow the residential project to be developed. However, to ensure that the potential impact on land use is addressed, the following mitigation measure shall be required:

> **LAND USE-1**: The applicant shall provide proof to the City of Huntington Beach of either an executed title settlement agreement between the California State Lands Commission and the property owner or a letter from the California State Lands Commission indicating that no agreement is needed prior to any issuance of a demolition or grading permit by the City of Huntington Beach. The entitlements for the project shall not become effective until such documentation is submitted and confirmed by the City of Huntington Beach.

Water Portion of the Site

The water portion of the site has a General Plan designation of OS-W (Open Space—Water Recreation) and a zoning

designation of OS-WR-CZ (Open Space—Water Recreation—Coastal Zone). The uses permitted under the current land use designation include uses for recreational purposes such as boating. The uses permitted under the current zoning designation include marinas and minor utilities. The current General Plan and zoning designations are not proposed to be amended.

In addition to the General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Local Coastal Program Amendment, the following entitlements are required for project implementation: 1) a Conditional Use Permit for development on vacant land; 2) a Coastal Development Permit for the residential development and infrastructure, and review and "approval in concept" of the boat slips/marina; 3) a Variance for deviation in the maximum building height; and 4) a Tentative Tract Map for subdivision of land for 15 residential condominium units and 15 private dockominium boat slips and 10 commercial boat slips.

Six of the proposed 10 commercial boat slips are located in the area within the California State Lands Commission's (CSLC) jurisdiction. In order to use this area for commercial boat slips, a lease from the CSLC would be needed. The applicant has provided a letter of intention to enter a lease agreement with the CSLC. Based on the Harmony Cove Navigation Channel Impact Review, prepared by Moffat & Nichol (February 2009), there is currently adequate maneuvering area for boats to navigate the channel with implementation of the proposed project. However, there is a staff recommended condition to provide a setback from the property line to provide adequate maneuvering area based on the future Marine Safety Division's needs and to accommodate the potential expansion of the docks on the west side of the channel.

A water channel surrounds the land portion of the subject site to the north and the west. Residential uses are developed to the east and north across the channel. The Bolsa Chica wetlands are located across Warner Avenue to the south, and institutional uses and residential uses (not directly) to the west.

In 1984, the Huntington Harbour Corporation (previous owner of the property) granted the City a revocable easement over this property for a boat dock/parking facility. In 2002, Tierrasanta (previous owner of the property after Huntington Harbour Corporation) recorded a Notice of Termination of the Easement on the Property. The Settlement Agreement between the City and Tierrasanta stipulated the reinstatement of R1 (currently RL) zoning on the unsubmerged (land) portion of the property. However, the applicant is requesting to amend both the zoning and land use designations to medium density residential (RM).

The mix of residential land uses in the vicinity of the project site in Huntington Harbour would support the medium density residential land use classifications. The proposed project density is 15 dwelling units per acre. To the west, but not directly across from the project site, there are medium density residential zones where 15 dwelling units per acre of land are allowed. East of the project site is the Weatherly Bay residential development where 10 dwelling units per acre were developed in the 1960s even though the current zoning allows for only 7 dwelling units per acre. The proposed land use amendments to medium density residential uses would be consistent with the patterns of land uses and compatible with the existing residential land uses in the surrounding area of Huntington Harbour.

The application also includes a variance request to deviate from the maximum building height of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO) (refer to discussion under Section XIII.—Aesthetics item c.). The proposed project complies with all other provisions of the RM (Residential Medium Density) zoning district and other applicable provisions of the HBZSO including building setbacks, off-street parking, open space requirements.

In addition, the proposed project would be consistent with the following goals and policies of the Land Use and Coastal Elements of the General Plan:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Goal LU 9—Achieve the development of a range of housing units that provides for the diverse economic, physical, and social needs of existing and future residents of Huntington Beach.

Policy LU 9.1.3—Require that multi-family residential projects be designed to convey a high level of quality and distinctive neighborhood character.

Goal C 1—Develop a land use plan for the Coastal Zone that protects and enhances coastal resources, promotes public access and balances development with facility needs.

Policy C 1.1.5—New residential development should be sited and designed in such a manner that it maintains and enhances public access to the coast.

Goal C 2—Provide coastal resource access opportunities for the public where feasible and in accordance with the California Coastal Act requirements.

Policy C 2.5.1—Require that existing public access to the shoreline and Huntington Harbour waterways be maintained and enhanced, where necessary and feasible, not withstanding overriding safety, environmental or privacy issues.

Policy C 3.2.1—Encourage, where feasible, facilities, programs and services that increase and enhance public recreational opportunities in the Coastal Zone.

Goal C 6—Prevent the degradation of marine resources in the Coastal Zone from activities associated with an urban environment.

Policy C 6.1.1—Require that new development include mitigation measures to enhance water quality, if feasible; and, at a minimum, prevent the degradation of water quality of groundwater basins, wetlands, and surface water.

The City's land use policies generally encourage projects that are compatible and harmonious with surrounding development, be designed to convey a high level of quality and distinctive neighborhood character, promote public access and enhance recreational opportunities in the Coastal Zone. The proposed project would not conflict with the identified goals and policies contained in the General Plan. The proposed project would be designed as a quality residential development that enhance the character of the neighborhood and provide public access to recreational opportunities in the Coastal Zone. In addition, the applicant has provided a letter of intention to pursue the lease and title settlement agreements to use the water portion of the project site for commercial boat slips and to remove the Public Trust Easement over the project site and develop a residential project. Therefore, with mitigation less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as none exists in the City. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The proposed project would not disrupt or physically divide an established community. The project is proposed on a vacant lot adjacent to a residential development and therefore it will not divide any established communities. The project would not impact access to surrounding development. No impacts are anticipated.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses)or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 4)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project includes 15 residential units and a 25-boat slip marina. The project will not induce substantial population growth in the area. With the average household size of 2.56 persons, the City's population is anticipated to increase by approximately 38 residents as a result of the project. The project is not expected to have a significant effect on the projected population of the City and would not cumulatively exceed official regional and local population projections. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The proposed project site is currently vacant. No residential uses exist on the subject site. Therefore, the project will not result in the displacement of any existing housing. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The proposed project site is currently vacant. The project will not result in the displacement of any existing residents. No impacts resulting from the development are anticipated.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault ? (Sources: 1, 14)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The site is located within the seismically active southern California area. Although the site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault area, a portion of the Newport-Inglewood fault traverses through Huntington Harbour,

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

and the project site is approximately 1,000 ft. from the southerly limit of the Special Studies Zone boundary for the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. Seismic hazards constitute an existing safety condition experienced by all development in the southern California region. Refer to discussion in III.a.ii. below, regarding standard construction and engineering practices required by the California Building Code (CBC). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 14) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies, and procedures which require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed Soils Engineer. Conformance with CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 14, 16) ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐

Discussion:

Huntington Harbour is located on a tidal flat alluvium. According to the Liquefaction Potential map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is located within an area identified as having a very high potential for liquefaction.

Land Portion of the Site

Based on the Preliminary Geology and Soils Report by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc. (January 2010), the landside portion of the site is prone to and exposed to the effects of seismic instability, which include lateral spreading and slope failure. Soils with liquefaction potential may be as deep as approximately 16 feet below the ground surface (approximate elevation of -6 feet) across the landside portion of the site. The potential for slope displacement due to seismic-induced settlement and lateral movements would be up to several feet. Thus, mitigation of potential seismic impacts is necessary in order to allow the proposed development of the site, specifically the subterranean parking garage and the residential building.

The geotechnical analysis provides three basic alternatives to address the stability of the slopes and foundation soils for the landside portion of the site:

1. Improve the in-situ strength characteristics of the subsurface soils using deep soil mixing (DSM) techniques to improve soil strength, thereby mitigating the potential lateral spreading and liquefaction impacts.
2. Support any proposed structure on a deep foundation system, such as caissons (cast-in-drilled-hole shafts), to accommodate the imposed lateral loads and induced soil movements associated with the lateral spreading and slope instability.
3. Improve the in-situ soils by installing Impact Piers to provide both soil reinforcement and soil stiffening to mitigate lateral spreading and liquefaction while reducing soil settlements and increasing bearing capacity.

To mitigate the potentially significant impacts of liquefaction, lateral spreading, and seismic-induced slope displacement or failure of the landside portion of the site, the following geotechnical mitigation measure shall be required:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

GEO-1: In order to improve the in-situ strength characteristics of the subsurface soils and improve the seismic stability of the slopes by reducing potential for lateral spreading and liquefaction, one or a combination of the following mitigation alternatives shall be implemented prior to issuance of building permits. The preferred method(s) shall be documented on grading and building plans.

a. Subsurface soils and slope areas shall be strengthened by the implementation of engineered in-situ soil remediation methods such as mixing cement slurry/grout into the weak soil layers to depths needed for stabilization.

b. The proposed structures, including the subterranean garage, shall be supported on a system of deep foundations, such as cast-in-drilled-hole shafts, designed to pass through the potentially liquefiable zones and potentially laterally displaced zone of soil.

c. Subsurface soils shall be strengthened by the installation of higher modulus columns of compacted aggregate to modify the vertical and lateral load-carrying capacity of the existing soils.

Implementation of one or a combination of the mitigation alternatives above would stabilize the soil to prevent slope displacement and liquefaction during a seismic-related event. Therefore, seismic-related ground failure impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Water Portion of the Site

The waterside portion of the project is not susceptible to the impacts of lateral spreading and slope failure because this portion would be dredged to an approximate elevation of -10 feet (NAVD 88) which would remove the potentially liquefiable soils. Foundations for the marina will be installed in the underlying non-liquefiable soils to a depth of 15 to 25 feet, further protecting the waterside improvements from the potential impact of liquefaction and lateral spreading.

The marina portion of the project consists primarily of floating docks attached to a series of concrete piles placed in the channel. The floating docks are connected to the upland walkway or bulkhead by ramps which can move up and down with the tides. As described in the Preliminary Geology and Soils Report by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc., a total of approximately 40 guide piles will be installed in the channel using a combination of jetting (digging with jetted water) and driving, with a vibratory hammer or pile driver, of the final 5 feet of penetration into competent substrate below the channel bottom (note the actual depth of piles will be determined during final marina engineering). The piles and docks will be designed to withstand constant tidal fluctuations, current movements, and storm flows in addition to a design seismic event as required by the California Building Codes. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan (1996), the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. However, the site is bound along the western and northern limits by a revetted slope that descends into the bay. Existing soil conditions of the slope are prone to and exposed to the effects of seismic instability, which could include lateral spreading and slope failure. There are no known landslides in the vicinity of the site, nor is the site in the path of any known or potential landslides. The proposed dredging work, construction of a vertical seawall to replace the revetted slope, and improvement of the subsurface soils on the site mentioned above will be engineered to

ensure stability of the soil and reduce the surcharge loads on the slope. However, construction activities may have the potential to create erosion or unstable soils conditions. Therefore, shoring methods would be needed to protect the surrounding properties and structures from potential collapse during construction. To mitigate the potential impacts of landslides during construction of the project, the following geotechnical mitigation measure is recommended:

GEO-2: In order to protect the adjacent properties, structures, and the Harbour from potential erosion or unstable soil conditions during construction, one of the following shoring alternatives shall be incorporated into the project design, grading plan and building plans:

a. Deep Soil Mixing (DSM) to a depth of 22 feet below finish grade within a 5-foot wide area along the easterly property line, and within a 10-foot wide area along the south, west, and north sides of the property.

b. Driving of sheet piles to a depth of -25 feet around the entire perimeter of the site.

c. Installing rammed aggregate impact piers to a depth of -16 feet.

Construction activities and the project will be engineered to ensure the stability of the soil and to protect the surrounding properties and structures from landslides. With mitigation, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 7)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The project site and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth in the range between 8.5 feet to 32 feet below (depending on the method employed) existing ground surface and grading of the entire site which could potentially result in erosion of soils or unstable soil conditions. Erosion will be minimized by compliance with standard City requirements for submittal of an erosion control plan prior to issuance of building permits, for review and approval by the Department of Public Works. Implementation of the proposed project would require significant alteration of the existing topography of the project site. Approximately 12,000 to 15,000 cubic yards of cut will be excavated depending on the liquefaction and lateral spreading mitigation method. Within the constraints of the excavation and surface grading, in the event that unstable soil conditions occur on the project site due to grading or placement of fill materials, these conditions would be remedied pursuant to the recommendations in the required geotechnical study for the project site. In addition, any plan for marina dredging and construction will incorporate recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineer to prevent landslides on the existing slope and adjacent properties and structures. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 7)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to Responses III.a iii) and III.a iv) for discussion of liquefaction and landslides, respectively, which have recommended mitigation measures. Subsidence is large-scale settlement of the ground surface generally caused by withdrawal of groundwater or oil in sufficient quantities such that the surrounding ground surface sinks over a broad area. The project site has not been identified as an area with the potential for subsidence. In addition, withdrawal of oil, or other mineral resources would not occur as part of the proposed project. The Preliminary Geology and Soils

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Report by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc. indicates that dewatering of the excavation is required. The project will include installing perimeter cut-off wall with interior sumps and pumps. The shoring and dewatering systems result in limited changes in the level of groundwater outside of the proposed excavation. Since ground settlement or soil instability is caused by the lowering of groundwater levels, the soil would not become unstable as a result of excavation. In addition, the proposed project will comply with all conditions imposed as part of any required 401 or 404 Water Quality Certification issued by the Regional Control Board. Less than significant impacts associated with subsidence are anticipated.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 7)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

According to the Expansive Soil Distribution map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is located within an area identified as having a low potential for expansive soil. However, soils with medium expansive potential were found on the site. Therefore, construction of the project will be subject to compliance with the California Building Code regarding applicable soils, grading, and structural foundation requirements, codes, and ordinances, such that any potential geologic impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance. Furthermore, the soil stabilization mitigation measures mentioned in item (a)(iii) would further ensure that any geologic impacts related to expansive soils would be reduced to a level of insignificance. With mitigation, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is located in an urbanized area in which wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. Therefore, the capability of the soils to support septic tanks or alternative waste water systems is not relevant to the proposed project. No impact would occur related to septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 19, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project is located adjacent to a recreational boating channel in Huntington Harbour and will include 25 docks for private and public use and 15 residential units. The site will be graded and engineered to drain into a proposed storm water piping system through inlets, trench drains and catch basins that will flow directly into a privately maintained onsite linear vault equipped with filter media for treatment prior to outletting into the Harbour. Two vaults are proposed along the bay-side slope bank of the property. A major portion of the existing site is currently drained directly into the Harbour through a single catch basin inlet and outlet pipe, while part of the site sheet flows over the bay-side slope into the Harbour. The project is subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements regarding discharge into impacted bodies of water. Submittal of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) is required to address construction site pollution prevention and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required to address post-construction pollution prevention.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Operation of the proposed marina and 15 residential units may result in the discharge of stormwater and urban runoff into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity), including water disturbances common to recreational boat operation and floating docks within the man-made harbor with the addition of the new docks or slips. The implementation of the WQMP would ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements and would reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

Construction of the project, including dredging of approximately 16,000 cubic yards of material to accommodate boat navigation and the placement of piles and floats, will result in increases in turbidity, sedimentation and lowered dissolved oxygen levels associated with the disturbance of sulfidic anoxic sediments during dredging operations at the work site for a short duration. Dredging operations will occur over a four to seven month period and may utilize a suction dredge or a mechanical excavator. During dredging and dock construction a general degradation of water quality will occur when bottom sediments are disturbed and fine particulates are suspended into the water column. The particulates could cause a short-term turbidity plume that would dissipate and clear with tidal movement of the water. Turbidity creates a murky condition in the water caused by the suspended particulates that absorb heat from the sunlight creating warmer waters. The suspended particulates also scatter the sunlight decreasing the photosynthetic activity of plants and algae. Impacts from turbidity can lead to a reduction in the concentration of oxygen in the water, which could inhibit growth of submerged aquatic plants and, in turn, affect the survival of other species dependent on those plants. The placement of filter fabric over the sediment within the water surrounding the dock construction zone will greatly reduce the likelihood of significant turbidity. Based on the scope of work, a less than significant increase in turbidity is anticipated. However, turbidity will be visually monitored during project implementation and a silt curtain will be installed to contain the suspended sediments if necessary. Use of a silt curtain will remain in place until the sediments settle and turbidity returns to normal. In cases where turbidity does not occur outside of the immediate work area and a silt curtain is not used, any localized turbidity will likely dissipate within one hour due to tidal flow. The silt curtain shall be installed prior to construction within the water way and/or prior to any dredging activity. The following mitigation measures are proposed to prevent and control turbidity:

> **HYDRO-1**: During all phases of the project during construction and post-construction, Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to prevent and control untreated runoff, turbidity and implement water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. BMPs may include sandbags, detention basins, clarifiers, and silt curtain(s). The silt curtain(s) shall be continually maintained free and clear of debris, shall be properly maintained without holes, rips, or tears, and shall remain in place for the duration of the marina construction and dredging activities or until permanent BMPs are installed and operational.
>
> **HYDRO-2**: If turbidity is observed at a distance of 100 feet or greater from the actual work site, either the work shall be stopped until the water returns to normal or, if deemed necessary, a silt curtain shall be installed until turbidity returns to normal.

Furthermore, the project will be required to obtain a 401 and 404 Water Quality Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 19)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

In 2005, the Huntington Beach Public Works Department prepared an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which analyzed the City's past and future water pipeline infrastructure, sources, supplies, reliability and availability. Based on the estimated water demand required for this project, it would not result in a significant increase in water demand consumption that was not previously planned for in the Water Master Plan and UWMP. Therefore, this project would not present a substantial impact to the groundwater supply and table.

According to the City's 2005 UWMP, groundwater wells currently supply 64 percent of the City's water, while the remaining 36 percent is imported. The project site largely consists of impervious surfaces at this time and the amount of impervious surfaces would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project. The project sit is neither a designated groundwater recharge area nor does the project site serve as a primary source of groundwater recharge. The City of Huntington Beach has two recharge facilities, the Talbert and Alamitos Barriers; neither of which will be impacted by the proposed project. Therefore, the potential for a reduction in groundwater recharge would be negligible and would not affect City groundwater wells. Less than significant impacts area anticipated.

The project is subject to compliance with the City's Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficiency Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which will ensure that water consumption is minimized. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project will increase the impervious area from the existing parking lot paving and sidewalks at approximately 80 percent of impervious area to approximately 90 percent impervious area. The project will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating submittal of grading plans and a Hydrology and Hydraulic Study for review and approval by the Public Works Department. A preliminary Hydrology Report and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates (April 2009) indicate that the proposed site runoff will enter the existing catch basin and discharge into Huntington Harbour after being treated by two Manufactured Treatment Vaults prior to release into the Harbour. With the development of the project, approximately 40 percent of the site will be paved, 50 percent will be covered with buildings, and 10 percent will be landscaped. Since the majority of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces, the land area with the proposed drainage pattern will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

The water portion of the proposed project will include docks and walkway areas for the marina, increasing the impervious area by a small amount. Since the existing dock drains directly into the Harbour and the new docks and the walkway areas for the marina are proposed to drain directly into the Harbour, there would be no change to the existing drainage pattern of the water portion of the site. The marina would not result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The proposed project will increase the impervious area from the existing parking lot paving and sidewalks at approximately 80 percent of impervious area to approximately 90 percent impervious area. The project will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating submittal of grading plans and a Hydrology and Hydraulic Study for review and approval by the Public Works Department to ensure compliance with water discharge requirements. The preliminary Hydrology Report and Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates (April 2009), indicate that area drains will surround the development to provide efficient drainage around the perimeter as well as key runoff areas such as parking lot, pavement, and swales. In addition, the project will be designed such that runoff for the proposed development that exceeds the pre-development condition will be mitigated by the implementation of BMPs before being conveyed to the Harbour. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The project, including the additional dock and walkway area for the marina, would increase the impermeable surface area within the project site, contributing to an increase in runoff of stormwater. This would include runoff that may contain pollutants which could potentially degrade surface water quality. A preliminary Hydrology Report and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates (April 2009) indicate that the proposed site runoff will enter the existing catch basin and discharge into Huntington Harbour after being treated by two Manufactured Treatment Vaults prior to release into the Harbour. The target treatment flow rate for a 1.00-acre site is calculated at 0.19 cubic feet per second (cfs). Installing two treatment units (filtering capacity of 0.27 cfs per unit) would ensure the maximum filtering capacity of a high flow event such as a 100-yr storm. The Report indicated that the treatment devices are appropriate for removing pollutants from stormwater runoff to comply with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The required pollutants to be removed from Huntington Harbour include chlordane, copper, lead, nickel, pathogens, PCBs, and sediment toxicity. According to the Report, the treatment devices have been proven to remove these pollutants to levels acceptable in terms of water quality standards.

A Hydrology and Hydraulics Study, subject to review and approval by the Public Works Department, will evaluate impacts from runoff generated by the proposed project. The project will be designed such that runoff for the proposed development that exceeds the pre-development condition will be mitigated by the implementation of BMPs before being conveyed to the Harbour. Although the existing drainage pattern is expected to be altered during the construction phase, erosion and siltation during construction will be minimized to less than significant level by employing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control, pursuant to a City approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For post construction BMPs, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) will be required. Required SWPPP and WQMP, to be submitted in accordance with City of Huntington Beach standard development requirements, will identify BMPs for ensuring a less than significant impact associated with polluted runoff.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a) above.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1, 8)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has designated the land portion of the site as Flood Zone AE (partially) and the water portion as AE with a base flood elevation of 7.0 feet (NAVD 88). Compliance with flood plain standards require elevation of the first floor of the 15 condominium units to be at least one foot above the base flood elevation, or 8.0 feet (NAVD 88). However, the City has established a minimum elevation of 9.0 feet (NAVD 88) for bulkheads and seawalls and a minimum finished floor elevation of 10 feet (NAVD 88) for residential buildings in the Harbour area. The project proposes to construct the first floor elevation at 15.5 feet and 4.0 feet for the subterranean garage. The existing site varies between a natural grade of 8.5 feet to 11.4 feet at Warner Avenue. As described above, the project does propose to construct a subterranean garage below the residential units and the elevated parking area. FEMA does allow the non-residential portion of buildings to be below the base flood elevation under the basic National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations. Under these conditions, the subterranean garage will need to be dry-floodproofed per the criteria found in FEMA Technical Bulletin 6-93, "Below-Grade Parking Requirements," and Technical Bulletin 3, "Non-Residential Floodproofing—Requirements and Certification," for necessary guidance on floodproofing designs for below grade parking garages. Hydrostatic and hydrodynamic forces must be considered in the design. A sufficient number of emergency exits must be available so that anyone in the garage will not be trapped by rising flood waters, and a warning and evacuation plan must be developed, tested and maintained onsite for emergency implementation. For flood insurance rating purposes, the NFIP requires that non-residential buildings be floodproofed to 1 foot above the base flood elevation to receive rating credit. The proposed construction, therefore, complies with the elevation requirements for new construction within the flood plain. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1, 8, 26)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed marina is located in the main channel of Huntington Harbour that provides tidal exchange between Huntington Harbour and existing wetlands. This channel conveys flood flow originating from the East Garden Grove Wintersburg Flood Control Channel that flows through Outer Bolsa Bay under Warner Avenue Bridge to Huntington Harbour and out to the Pacific Ocean. The location of the proposed marina is currently open water lined with a rock revetment adjacent to the Warner Avenue Bridge. The area has experienced sedimentation in the past, resulting in the formation of a shoal that presents a hazard to navigation. To allow safe navigation, the area of the proposed marina will be dredged.

An Analysis of Changes in Water Levels, Current Speeds, and Sedimentation for the proposed project was prepared by Everest International Consultants, Inc. (March 2009). A hydrodynamic model was used to estimate current speeds and water levels throughout the study area of Anaheim Bay, Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge, Huntington Harbour and tidally connected parts of the Bolsa Chica Wetlands. As mentioned above, the area of the proposed marina will be dredged to allow for safe navigation. The dredging will increase the cross sectional area at the marina, creating a deeper underwater ground level. For long-term water levels and current speeds, the study found that there will be no discernible change in the water levels and the current speeds will become slower in ebb and flood tide currents associated with the proposed marina. For extreme water levels and current speeds (including flood flows of a 10-, 50-, and 100-year flood flows), the study concluded that there will be negligible changes in high water levels and current speeds with the proposed marina. Based on this information, the construction of the marina would not impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-yr flood hazard area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 8, 32)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The land portion of the subject property is located within Flood Insurance Rate Map Zone AE with the base flood elevation of 7.0 feet (NAVD 88). Compliance with Federal Flood Development standards require elevation of the first floor of the 15 condominium units to be at least one foot above the base flood elevation, or 8.0 feet (NAVD 88). However, the City has established a minimum elevation of 9.0 feet (NAVD 88) for bulkheads and seawalls and a minimum finished floor elevation of 10 feet (NAVD 88) for residential buildings in the Harbour area. The project proposes to construct the first floor elevation at 15.5 feet and 4.0 feet for the subterranean garage. Because the residential buildings are built 8.5 feet above the base flood elevation of 7.0 feet, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss from a 100-year flood event, including levee failure. The subterranean garage, proposed to be constructed below the base flood elevation at 4.0 feet, will be dry-floodproofed per the criteria found in FEMA Technical Bulletin 6-93, "Below-Grade Parking Requirements" and Technical Bulletin 3, "Non-Residential Floodproofing—Requirements and Certification". As a result, the subterranean garage will not be exposed to a significant risk of loss.

According to Randy Mason of URS Cash & Associates, the marina designer for the Harmony Cove Project, the proposed marina (docks, guide piles) will be designed to accommodate the flood flow with high current velocity of a 100-year storm event. The docks nearest to the Warner Bridge will be designed as "wave-attenuator" dock type and the remaining docks will be designed in typical industry fashion. Pre-stressed concrete piles ranging from 20 to 24 inch diameter will be installed to support the "wave attenuator" docks and the guide piles will be set at +15.0 or +16.0 Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) to ensure that docks will not be overtopped during severe high water conditions of a storm event. For floating docks to withstand the forces of a severe flood event, a standard design procedure for wave attenuator docks of using structural wide flange beams with nailers will be used to connect floating concrete modules together. In addition, the orientation of the proposed marina being slightly angled to the north will provide protection from floating debris during flood-type events. These design features would reduce the risk of damage to the proposed marina during a flooding event. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 8)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

According to the Moderate Tsunami Run-up Area map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is not located in an identified moderate tsunami run-up area. The project site is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow and therefore no impacts are anticipated.

k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a) above. Refer to the mitigation measures under Section IV (a).

l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 20, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a), (c) and (d) above. The preliminary Water Quality Management Plan, prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates, discusses the Best Management Practices for marina/dock from the Clean Marinas California Program in order to prevent or reduce pollution in coastal waters. The project, including the additional dock and walkway area for the marina, will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating submittal of a final Water Quality Management Plan for review and approval by the Public Works Department to ensure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The WQMP shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a precise grading permit for the project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 20, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a) above. In accordance with standard City of Huntington Beach development requirements, Hydrology and Hydraulic studies for both on-site and off-site facilities, Storm Drain, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) conforming with the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, prepared by a Licensed Civil Engineer, shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Specific requirements and measures to be incorporated into the required studies and plans are identified in City Policies, Standard Plans, and Code Requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance and Municipal Code. The proposed residential and marina project is not anticipated to have areas of material storage, vehicles or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance, waste handling or storage, other outdoor work areas. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The receiving waters for the project site are Huntington Harbour channels. Designated beneficial uses for Huntington Harbour include: navigation; water and non-water contact recreation; commercial and sport fishing; wildlife habitat; rare, threatened, or endangered species; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; and marine habitat. Huntington Harbour is on the 2006 Federal Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the following pollutants: chlordane, copper, lead, nickel, pathogens, PCBs, and sediment toxicity. The required Water Quality Management Plan will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address the pollutants of concern from the discharge of stormwater.

The Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan identifies a stormwater treatment system as one potential treatment control BMP for the residential portion of the project, chosen for its efficiency in removing various pollutants of concern. Polluted stormwater entering the treatment system would encounter a screening device to remove larger pollutants and then enter a hydrodynamic chamber which settles out the sediments and larger suspended solids. Next, the runoff would be treated by a filter media that removes fine and associated pollutants, including bacteria. From there, the runoff would enter the bioretention filter in the form of a subsurface flow with mechanisms to remove the remaining particulates and dissolved pollutants. The purified runoff would leave the treatment system via a discharge

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

chamber. The treatment devices are appropriate for removing pollutants from stormwater runoff to levels acceptable in terms of water quality standards to comply with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

For the marina project, BMPs from the Clean Marinas California Program shall be utilized to prevent or reduce pollution in coastal waters. These BMPs relate to good boat-keeping practices, education, signs, notices, marina rules and regulations, waste receptacles, spill prevention, and rapid clean-up plans such as:

- All spills must be cleaned up immediately. Use absorbent materials to clean up liquid spills. Do not rinse spills into the water. Dry sweeping techniques or vacuuming must be used for the clean up of spills.
- Boaters must properly manage and dispose of all wastes and materials.
- Place trash receptacles and dumpsters in convenient locations for boaters and guests. Keep trash enclosures clean and free of debris.
- Dispose all solid wastes in accordance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
- Use pamphlets, flyers, newsletters, inserts and/or meetings to convey the importance of any environmental precautions that the marina has instituted.
- Use signs to inform boaters about equipment, disposal containers, cleaning practices, etc. Special instructions should be clearly noted.

The requirement of submittal of and compliance with the approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) conforming with the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements would prevent violation of water quality standards. Existing regulations would ensure that the potential of discharges of polluted stormwater to affect beneficial uses of receiving waters would be not be substantial. Implementation of the BMPs would minimize stormwater discharge pollution into the Harbour. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (e) above.

p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (c) above. The precise grading plan will include an erosion control plan for the construction phase of the project. The construction of a vertical seawall, approximately 35 feet in height (25 feet below water level and 10 feet above the water level), to replace the revetted slope would result in the surface areas for erosion to occur. In addition, the seawall would act as a barrier, protecting the land side from the water side of the project and therefore minimizing the potential erosion of the project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

V. AIR QUALITY. The city has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 9, 10, 15)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

Refer to the discussion for items V (b) below.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 9, 10, 15)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Short-term

The construction of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; grading activities including the transport of any necessary soil import and/or export, delivery and hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. To reduce emissions, standard City requirements regulate operational construction conditions by requiring construction equipment be maintained in peak operating condition, the use of low sulfur fuel by weight, prohibiting truck idling for periods longer than ten minutes, and discontinuing construction activity during second stage smog alerts. Emissions during construction were calculated using URBEMIS 2007 program (version 9.2.4). The allotment of equipment to be utilized during each phase was based on defaults in the URBEMIS 2007 program and was modified as needed to represent the specifics of the proposed project. The amount of soil excavation (43,448 cubic yards) and the truck trips necessary to haul the excavated soil was taken into consideration. The default level of detail was used to calculate fugitive dust emissions from activity on the approximately 1.00 acre site.

The URBEMIS model calculates total emissions, on-site and off-site, resulting from each construction activity which are compared to the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. A comparison of the project's total emissions with the regional thresholds is provided below. A project with daily construction emission rates below these thresholds is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality.

Construction Emissions SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	111.0	40.0	90.8	5.3	3.7	0.3
Significance Threshold	550	75	100	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table, construction emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds. VOC levels are associated with only the exterior coating for the residential structures. Therefore a less than significant impact during construction is anticipated.

Long-term

Air pollutant emissions due to the project were also calculated using the URBEMIS 2007 program version (9.4.2). The program was set to calculate emission for 15 residential units, a subterranean parking structure, and a 25-boat-slip marina. The default URBEMIS 2007 variables were used for the calculations.

Operational Emissions SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx
Estimated Project Emissions for proposed project	408.5	23.4	38.3	3.8	1.3	0.0
Significance Threshold	550	75	55	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table, operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds.

Typical sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, etc. The nearest sensitive receptors that have the potential to be affected by the project development are residences to the east and north of the project site. Since the project's emission would not exceed the regional thresholds, impacts to sensitive receptors are less than significant.

The project site is located in the SCAQMD, which is currently in nonattainment for ozone and PM10 under national and State standards, and CO under national standards. Because the project would not exceed regional significance thresholds, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution with regards to criteria pollutants.

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is the region's applicable air quality plan and was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. Although the proposed project is proposing a general plan amendment to add 7 residential units over the allowable density at the project site, the incremental increase in population is approximately 19 residents with the average household size of 2.56 persons. The project is not expected to have a significant effect on the projected population of the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AQMP and less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Based on the calculations using the URBEMIS 2007 program version (9.4.2) and the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 9, 15)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

Refer to the discussion for items V (b) above.

d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 9) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The operation of the 25-boat slip marina will contribute additional boat exhaust within Huntington Harbour. However, the marina is proposed within an existing recreational boating harbor, contributing only a small incremental increase in exhaust odors. The 15 residential units are not expected to create any objectionable odors. The emissions of significant odors would not be anticipated during construction. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 9, 10, 15) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

Refer to the discussion for items V (b) above.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1, 10, 23) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

Based on the Bayview Trip Generation and Parking Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (August 2008), the proposed development is projected to result in approximately 119 new vehicle trips per day. A new ingress and egress driveway is proposed along Warner Avenue and located approximately 750 ft. east of the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway and Warner Avenue. Warner Avenue is designated as a Major Arterial Street in the Circulation Element of the General Plan (1996).

The Transportation Division of the City of Huntington Beach has indicated that acceptable levels of service (LOS) for roadway segments and intersections exist in the project vicinity. The City's General Plan considers LOS for all surrounding roadway segments and intersections acceptable. The Trip Generation Analysis concluded that traffic generation associated with the project would not cause a significant increase in vehicle trips. The project is subject to standard code requirements including the payment of traffic impact fees to minimize any potential impacts.

Construction traffic resulting from development of the project may result in short-term interruptions to traffic circulation, including pedestrian, bicycle, and boat flow. Based on the scope of the project construction, the short-term interruptions to traffic are not considered to be significant. These potential impacts will be reduced through implementation of code requirements requiring Department of Public Works approval of a construction vehicle control plan.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

With regard to the Harbour right-of-way, the project site is located adjacent to a public waterway cul-de-sac available to the City's Marine Services Division, Huntington Harbour Yacht Club, and members of the public. The flow of boat traffic may be impeded as a result of construction and the potential impacts will be reduced through the Department of the Public Works approval of a staging area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 10) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

Refer to the discussion under item VI.a. above. Increased trip generation from long-term operation of the project will not exceed level of service (LOS) standards on designated Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) intersections in the project vicinity, including Warner Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway and Bolsa Chica Street/Warner Avenue intersections. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 10, 12) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airstrip and does not propose any structures of substantial height to interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The project site is located along a major arterial street that provides access to the site. Project access will be provided via a new driveway off Warner Avenue. The project is subject to compliance with City standards for vision clearance at street/driveway intersections, minimum drive aisle widths and vehicle turning radii designed to ensure hazards are minimized. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

The project site is located adjacent to a public waterway cul-de-sac available for use by the public as well as the City's Marine Services Division and Huntington Harbour Yacht Club across the channel. The proposed marina will be designed to accommodate the existing boat traffic volumes and uses in the waterway in terms of maneuvering and flow. The channel will be dredged to achieve the appropriate depth to support the different boat types and sizes. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 32) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

Emergency access to and within the project site would be designed to meet City of Huntington Beach Police Department and City of Huntington Beach Fire Department requirements, as well as the City's general emergency access requirements. The proposed marina would be designed to accommodate the emergency boat launching capabilities of the Marine Services Division's current operations at the Warner Dock, a city-owned dock located across the channel from the project site. The Marine Services Division utilizes the Warner Dock to store three 30-foot long boats which are used to patrol the city's coastline. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

Chapter 231 (Off-Street Parking and Loading Provisions) of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO) requires multi-family residential developments to provide parking at a rate of 2 spaces (1 enclosed) per two-bedroom unit, 2.5 spaces (1 enclosed) per three or more bedroom unit, and ½ space per unit for guests. In addition, the project proposes to provide ¾ space per boat slip. Based on the HBZSO, 50 parking spaces (42 spaces for residential use and 8 spaces for marina use) are required for the project (refer to the table below). A total of 53 parking spaces are proposed for the project. The proposed parking complies with parking requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance. No significant impacts are anticipated.

PARKING REQUIREMENT FOR HARMONY COVE PROJECT			
	Quantity	Parking Rate	Required Parking
Two Bedrooms	8 units	2 spaces	16 spaces
Three or More Bedrooms	7 units	2.5 spaces	18 spaces
Guest	15 units	½ space	8 spaces
Commercial Boat Slips	10 slips	¾ space	8 spaces
Total			50 spaces

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 2, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project will provide bicycle racks onsite, in accordance with the requirements of the HBZSO Section 231.20—*Bicycle Parking*. No impacts are anticipated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10, 24, 25)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project involves the construction of a new 25-boat slip marina within Huntington Harbour, which supports some marine biological habitats. The construction of the marina would result in the removal of the piles and dock floats, dredging, construction of a vertical seawall to replace the revettment of rock riprap, and construction of new piles and dock floats. In order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed marina project, a Biological Assessment was prepared by MBC Applied Environmental Sciences (July 2009). The Biological Assessment includes a survey of Intertidal Organisms, Subtidal Eelgrass, Algae, Fish and Invertebrates, Subtidal Organisms, Subtidal Soft Bottom Benthos. Attachment # 3 shows the biological resources survey area. The Biological Assessment found the following marine resources within the project area: for the Intertidal Organisms, there were barnacles, limpets, bay

mussels, oysters, sea squirts, and sponges; for the Subtidal Organisms, there were mollusks, snails, crabs, sponges, bay mussels, algae, and no eelgrass; for the Subtidal Soft Bottom Benthos, there were anemone and worms.

The Biological Assessment also identified sensitive species (two bird species and two marine mammals) that are identified as protected, rare, sensitive, threatened or endangered by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that may be expected in the area at various times. They include California Brown Pelican, Peregrine Falcon, Harbor Seal, and California Sea Lion but they were not observed at the time of the study.

Based on the project submittals, the Biological Assessment indicates a net increase in permanent and floating docks totaling approximately 5,859 sq. ft. from the previous cover of approximately 616 sq. ft. Development of the proposed project would have the following impacts to marine resources:

Subtidal Fish and Invertebrates—There would be a loss of hard bottom habitat and subtidal habitat due to the removal of the rocky riprap and placement of dock pier pilings. This loss would be small in area and would be mitigated by the increase in subtidal and intertidal area afforded by the pilings and docks. The area affected by the removal of the riprap is approximately 5,250 sq. ft. and the replacement area of the new pier pilings is approximately 5,300 sq. ft. There would be a loss of benthic invertebrate populations and fish species that use the bay bottom in the short term during dredging operations. However, when the riprap is removed and the area is dredged, there will be an increase in shallow water soft bottom habitat of 2,700 sq. ft. The short term loss of these species is then mitigated by the additional soft bottom habitat.

Subtidal Eelgrass and Algae—Since there was no eelgrass or any algal species of environmental concern were observed at or near the project site, there would be no significant impacts on the subtidal and algal communities associated with this project. Even though the updated survey found no eelgrass in the project site, eelgrass was found in the past. There is a possibility that eelgrass could be present at some time in the future. Therefore, mitigation would be required if it is found during any future survey. The following mitigation measures for impacts to eelgrass in accordance to the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy shall be implemented in the event that the eelgrass habitat repopulates the project site:

> **BIO-1**: Pre-construction (within 60 days of a disturbing activity) and post-construction (30 days of cessation of the project) eelgrass surveys shall be conducted to determine the level of eelgrass loss, if any, as a result of the project activities. This survey shall be valid for 60 days unless conducted between August and October, in which case it is valid until March 1 of the following year.
>
> **BIO-2**: Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, any loss in acreage of eelgrass habitat shall be mitigated according to State and Federal environmental policies. Mitigation may include out-of kind mitigation (suitable to the resource agencies) if the total area is less than 10 square meters, or replacement at a 1.2 to 1 ratio (for every 1 square meter of eelgrass disturbed or lost, 1.2 square meters is to be replaced) in a suitable location if the total is more than 10 square meters. In the event of replacement, subsequent success monitoring at six months, and annually beginning at one year through five years with success criteria as determined in the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy.

Sensitive Species—Although no sensitive species were observed within the project site during the survey, they are known to use the Harbour area for foraging and nesting. The close proximity of Huntington Harbour to other environmentally sensitive habitats such as Bolsa Chica suggests that some of these marine species have used and will continue to use the site for foraging or roosting. Increased turbidity during project construction may reduce localized foraging ability for these species within the immediate area of work. A reduction in local foraging ability may result in adverse effects if the turbidity plume extends over a large portion of the surrounding area. The marine mammals of

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

concern include Harbor Seal and California Sea Lion. The avian species of primary concern is the California least tern, a migratory water-associated bird present in the Harbour from April to October of each year. An extensive least tern nesting colony exists at the nearby Bolsa Chica State Ecological Reserve located further up the tidal system. The nest sites are approximately 1.0 mile from the project area. To mitigate the potential significant impacts to the foraging opportunities for protected species, it is recommended that seasonal timing restrictions be employed for dredging and other turbidity generating work.

BIO-3: Dredging and other turbidity generating work shall be limited to the months of November to March to minimize impacts to foraging and nesting for protected avian species. If dredging and pile driving activities cannot be timed to avoid encroachment into the least tern nesting season, the applicant shall be required to effectively contain visibly detectable surface turbidity associated with in water construction activities to the smallest footprint practicable and not more than 0.5 acre maximum during the least tern season. During construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct weekly monitoring of the silt curtain(s) and monitor water quality at a distance of no more than 10 meters outside of the silt curtain and 100 meters upcurrent of the silt curtain. Turbidity (via light transmittance) shall be measured at 1 meter above the bottom, mid-depth, and one meter below the surface both at 10 meters and 100 meters from the dredge operations. A decrease in light transmittance of more than 30% (average of the three readings) from that found 100 meter upcurrent shall result in a suspension of dredging until the cause is corrected. Additionally, dissolved oxygen concentrations (DO) and hydrogen ion concentrations (pH) shall be measured at the same depths and locations. Dredge operations shall be suspended at any time the biological oxygen demand causes concentrations of DO to be less than 5 mg/l and pH to drop below 7.5 (average of the three measurements) in the area within 10 meters of the silt curtain unless ambient condition DOs are below 5 mg/l and pH below 7.5 at the station 100 meters upcurrent. In the event that turbidity extends beyond the allowable limits, turbidity generating activities shall cease until such time as turbidity levels are brought back into compliance.

BIO-4: If sea lions, seals (or other marine mammals), or sea turtles are observed within 100 meters of the construction or dredging process, all in water activity shall cease until observations indicate the marine mammals or turtles have departed the work site.

With implementation of the mitigation measures recommended above, all impacts to biological resources can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10, 24, 25)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item VII (a) above. Refer to mitigation measures under Section VII (a).

c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The project does not contain any wetlands. However, the Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve is located approximately 100 feet south of the project site across Warner Avenue. Less than significant impacts would occur.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 10, 24, 25)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item VII (a). Refer to mitigation measures under Section VII (a).

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 10, 24, 25)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

The Coastal Element of the City's General Plan includes goals and policies to prevent degradation of marine resources in the Coastal Zone from activities associated with an urban environment. Per the Coastal Element, new development within the coastal zone is required to include measures to mitigate adverse impacts of human activities on the marine environment and to protect areas and species of biological significance. The development of the residential and marina project would have potentially significant impacts upon marine organisms and sensitive biological species. Refer to item VII (a) for the discussion on biological resources impacts and mitigation measures. The incorporation of the mitigation measures would ensure that the project would conform to the policies of the Coastal Element. With mitigation, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

The site currently contains approximately 18 trees that would be impacted by construction. All the trees are proposed to be removed, stored and planted back on the site after the construction. Construction of the project will be subject to standard City requirements for the submittal of landscape plans demonstrating compliance with current code requirements and the replacement of existing mature healthy trees to be removed at a minimum of 2:1 ratio. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan for the area; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The proposed development will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource. The project site is not designated as a known mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan. No impacts are anticipated.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. Development of the project is not anticipated to have any impact on any mineral resource. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Hazardous materials for the development and operation of the proposed project do not represent uses that involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials beyond typical household wastes and cleaning products. In addition, the recreational boat marina does not include any fueling stations. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Recreational boating activities are currently present within Huntington Harbour. The proposed 25 floating docks represent a small increase in boat storage capacity and therefore a small increase in boat traffic within the vicinity. Although the additional boat traffic may result in a small increased risk of accident, the increase of 25 boat slips is not considered significant.

Hazardous or flammable substances that would be used during the construction phase would include vehicle fuels and oils in the operation of heavy equipment for onsite excavation and construction. Construction vehicles may require routine or emergency maintenance that could result in the release of oil, diesel fuel, transmission fluid or other materials. The proposed construction and operation would comply with CalOSHA (California Occupational Safety and Health Administration) requirements, the Hazardous Materials Management Act (HMMA), and other State and local requirements. Compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations would minimize risks associated with accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. All fill soil (on-site and imported) shall meet City Specification #431-92 – Soil Cleanup Standards and would be submitted to the Fire Department for review and joint approval with the Public Works Department prior to issuance of a grading permit. Discovery of additional soil contamination during ground disturbing activities is required to be reported to the Fire Department immediately and the approved work plan modified accordingly in compliance with City Specification #431-92. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The nearest school, Harbour View Elementary School, is approximately one mile from the project site. The proposed residential units and marina do not represent uses that involve the routine use or transport of hazardous materials beyond typical household wastes and cleaning products. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is not listed on any list of hazardous materials sites. No impacts are anticipated.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or pubic use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Although the City of Huntington Beach is included in the Orange County Airport Environs Land Use Plan due to the Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center, the project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts are anticipated.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is not located near any private airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 12, 29, 32)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project has been reviewed by the Fire Department and is designed to be in compliance with fire access and circulation requirements. Based on the Harmony Cove Navigation Channel Impact Review, prepared by Moffat & Nichol (February 2009), there is currently adequate maneuvering area for boats to navigate the channel with implementation of the proposed project. However, there is a staff recommended condition to provide a setback from the property line to provide adequate maneuvering area based on the future Marine Safety Division's needs and to accommodate the potential expansion of the docks on the west side of the channel. The proposed development of the site will not interfere or conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project is located in Huntington Harbour, a man-made residential marina complex constructed in the 1960s and is not near any wild lands. No impacts would occur.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 5, 30)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Implementation of the proposed project would involve the construction of 15 condominium units and a 25-boat slip marina. Construction would involve the construction of the seawall and sidewalk, dredging, construction of the marina, building foundation and support, and residential building, all of which would involve the use of heavy equipment and therefore sources of noise. Each stage of construction would involve a different mix of operating equipment and noise levels would vary based on the number and types of equipment in operation and the location of the activity. Residential uses near the property will experience audible noise levels during construction of the proposed project. The closest sensitive uses to the proposed project site would be the occupants of the residential uses across the Harbour channel to the north, approximately 250 feet from the project site, the residential uses east of the site, approximately 90 feet from the project site, and the residential uses across the Harbour channel to the west, approximately 250 feet from the project site. The construction phase that would generate the greatest noise levels would be the pile driving phase associated with the construction of the marina, which is anticipated to last approximately 3 months total (1.5 months for the seawall construction and up to 1.5 months for the marina construction based on the pile driving option). There are two different options in the pile driving activities. One option is that the installation of the piles will be spread over a six-week period with one week for the initial guide piles and five weeks for the remaining piles. The guide piles will be jetted into place while the vibratory hammer will only be used to penetrate the last five feet to the final depth recommended by the soils engineer. It is anticipated that it could take approximately 30 minutes to two hours to install each pile. Based on the installation methods, the noise and vibration impacts are intermittent. With a total of 40 piles and the duration of six weeks, an average of 1.3 piles per day will be installed. The other option is that the installation of the piles will be spread over a ten-day period with three days for the initial guide piles and seven days for the remaining piles. It is anticipated that it could take two hours to install each pile. Based on the installation methods, the noise and vibration are constant for 8 hours. With a total of 40 piles and duration of ten days, four piles per day will be installed. Based on the Environmental Noise and Vibration Analysis, prepared by Gordon Bricken & Associates (December 2009), the approximate noise levels experienced by these adjacent sensitive uses due to construction activities occurring at the project site have been estimated to reach 89 dBA for uses to the north, 111 dBA for uses to the east, and 89 dBA for uses to the west. These noise levels could exceed the maximum measured ambient noise levels by as much as 25 dBA to the north, 47 dBA to the east, and 30 dBA to the west.

Short-Term

Under Section 8.40.090 (d) of Chapter 8.40 of the City's Municipal Code, noise sources associated with construction are exempt from the requirements of the Municipal Code, provided that the applicant has acquired the proper permit(s) from the City and construction activities do not occur between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, including Saturdays, or at any time on Sundays or federal holidays. In order to minimize disruptions to adjacent properties, the project will be required to comply with the limitation of construction hours. Noise related to construction activities are exempt by the Municipal Code. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Recognizing that there are residential uses in the vicinity of the project site that will experience audible noise levels during construction, mitigation measures are recommended to minimize the noise levels to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures include:

NOISE-1: The Applicant shall require by contract specifications that the following construction best management practices (BMPs) be implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels:

- Notification shall be mailed to owners and occupants of all developed land uses immediately bordering or directly across the Harbour channel from the project site area providing a schedule for major construction activities that will occur through the duration of the construction period. In addition, the notification shall include the identification and contact number for a community liaison and designated construction manager that shall be available on-site during all construction activities. Contact information for the community liaison and construction manager shall be located at the construction office, City Hall, and the Police Department.

- Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards. Shut off or run noise generating equipment and machinery on their lowest settings when not in use.

- Implement the best available technology throughout all construction activities in noise attenuation measures, including but not limited to sound barriers or noise blankets. If necessary, erect a temporary sound barrier at least 12 feet high (referenced to the existing project grade) along the entire length of the east property line to minimize the noise impacts for the nearest sensitive receptors. This barrier shall remain throughout the entire construction phase of the project.

- Ensure that all construction work that would be expected to create high noise and/or vibration levels shall be carefully scheduled to be performed in the least amount of time possible.

- Where feasible, all stationary equipment or localized work creating high noise levels shall be surrounded by portable eight-foot high acoustical screens.

- All project personnel shall be made aware of the potential for noise and vibration impacts and shall practice good neighbor policies designed to minimize noise and vibration impacts at all times.

NOISE-2: The Applicant shall require by contract specifications that construction staging areas, along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the project site, are located as far away from vibration- and noise-sensitive sites as possible. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City.

NOISE-3: The applicant shall be required to submit a noise and vibration control plan to the Planning and Building Director for approval prior to the start of construction. Features that shall be included in the noise and vibration control plan are:

- A list of all major noise and vibration generating equipment that will be used on the site for each phase of construction.
- Noise and vibration predictions at each of the sensitive receptors that were indentified in the report for each phase of the construction.
- Locations, heights, and materials for noise barriers that may be employed and schedule for their installation.
- Other mitigation measures that will be used. These might include use of temporary noise barriers for stationary equipment, use of low-noise and vibration equipment or highly efficient mufflers, and alternative construction methods.

Under mitigation measure NOISE-1, the implementation of noise attenuation measures may include the use of noise barriers (e.g., sound walls) or noise blankets. As a general rule, a sound wall is able to reduce noise by 5 dBA. In addition, mitigation measure NOISE-2, which requires that construction staging areas and earthmoving equipment be located as far away from noise and vibration-sensitive land uses as possible, would also reduce construction-related noise levels. Mitigation measure NOISE-3 would assist surrounding residential properties anticipate the timing and duration of noise activities by providing information on noise and vibration generating equipments and their installation schedule.

Long-Term

The 25-boat slip marina and 15 residential units are proposed within an existing waterway of a recreational and residential Harbour channel. Boat traffic in and around the Harbour is extremely common. The proposed project will contribute to current ambient boat noise within the recreational boat harbor. However, the project is not anticipated to create long-term noise impacts different from existing ambient conditions and no services typically found in a marina are proposed. The site will not provide pump-out facilities, fueling, laundry, restrooms, showers, or any other type of amenity that may produce noise impacts.

Residential uses would be required to be designed to meet or exceed a 45 dBA interior noise standard, consistent with the 1996 Noise Element and with the California Building Code. The interior noise levels of the proposed residential units would exceed the noise standard as a result of traffic noise from Warner Avenue (75 dBA at 50 feet north of the center of Warner Avenue) and Pacific Coast Highway (60 dBA at 800 feet east of the center of Pacific Coast Highway). The use of different building materials would be integrated into the design of the proposed project in order to not exceed the interior noise threshold. However, some residential units would require additional noise reduction methods. The following mitigation measure shall be required in the final design of residential units to reduce the potentially significant impacts of interior noise levels:

NOISE-4: The final design of residential units shall incorporate the following building materials to comply with the interior noise standards:

- Add STC 24 glazing to all residential units unless otherwise noted.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

- Add STC 26 glazing to all rooms with any view of Warner Avenue and/or Pacific Coast Highway from Units 4, 5, 11, 12, and 13.

- Add STC 28 glazing to all rooms with any view of Warner Avenue and/or Pacific Coast Highway from Units 6 and 14.

- Add STC 36 glazing to all rooms with any view of Warner Avenue and/or Pacific Coast Highway from Units 7 and 15.

- If the interior allowable noise levels are met by requiring that windows are unopenable or remain closed, the design of the structure must also specify a ventilation or air conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment. The ventilation system must not compromise the dwelling unit's noise reduction.

Implementation of specific building materials for the different residential units will reduce the long-term noise impacts to a less than significant level.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 5, 30, 31)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

Short-Term

Groundborne Vibration and Noise Affecting People

Certain construction activities, such as pile driving activities, related to the proposed project would have the potential to generate groundborne vibration and noise and impact sensitive receptors surrounding the project site. Groundborne noise from vibration that would impact sensitive receptors was analyzed by Gordon Bricken & Associates in the Environmental Noise and Vibration Analysis (December 2009). According to the Study, the vibration levels due to construction of the proposed project would exceed the vibration impact threshold of 85 VdB set by the Federal Transit Administration for sensitive receptors. The approximate vibration levels experienced by these adjacent sensitive uses due to construction activities occurring at the project site have been estimated to reach 102 VdB for uses to the north, 102 VdB for uses to the east, and 98 VdB for uses to the west. These vibration levels could exceed the vibration threshold levels by as much as 17 VdB to the north, 17 VdB to the east, and 13 VdB to the west.

The vibration levels are associated only with construction of the marina and will be temporary in nature. The pile driving phase during construction of the marina is anticipated to last approximately six weeks or ten days total, depending on the pile driving option chosen. With the six-week period option, the pile driving activities will last approximately 30 minutes to two hours per pile with an average of 1.3 piles per day installed. With the ten-day period option, the pile driving activities will last approximately two hours per pile with up to 4 piles per day installed. Although construction of the proposed project would generate groundborne noise and vibration levels higher than the threshold for residential properties, noise sources associated with construction are exempt under Chapter 8.4 – *Noise Control* of the City's Municipal Code. Consequently, impacts are considered less than significant. However, in addition to a standard condition of approval limiting construction to 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday and prohibiting construction on Sundays and Federal holidays, a mitigation measure further limiting the hours and duration of pile-driving activities is recommended to reduce noise from groundborne vibration resulting from construction of the proposed project.

To reduce the groundborne noise and vibration resulting from construction of the proposed project to the extent possible, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

NOISE-5: Pile-driving activities shall be scheduled between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Mondays through Fridays only. Piles shall be installed with jetting, predrilling, or pile cushioning to reduce the duration of pile-driving.

Groundborne Vibration and Noise Affecting Structures

Groundborne vibration impacting sensitive structures was analyzed by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc. in the Preliminary Geology and Soils Report (January 2010). The study utilized the Caltrans Vibration Manual in determining vibration threshold criteria for possible damage to structures. According to the study, vibration levels at which structures could be potentially damaged vary depending on the type of structure. For instance, the threshold for possible damage to older residential buildings is 0.30 ips (inches per second), whereas the threshold for engineered structures would be 1.5 ips. Within the limits of the study area, there are four structures that may potentially be impacted due to vibration from construction activities. The structures include the Weatherly Bay swimming pool complex (approximately 22 feet from the eastern property line), Weatherly Bay tennis court (approximately 9 feet from the eastern property line), Weatherly Bay eastern site property wall (adjacent to the eastern property line), and the Warner Avenue Bridge (adjacent to the southern property line). Attachment # 4 shows the proximity of the project site to these four structures. Although the tennis court is not necessarily a structure, there is a potential "trip" hazard that could be created due to movement between panels or cracks as a result of groundborne vibration. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, the tennis court has been categorized as a "special structure". Of the various construction activities, shoring for the excavation of the lower garage level and the Impact Piers alternative for stabilizing the soil would exceed the established thresholds for groundborne vibration and potentially cause damage to all of the structures described above. Installation of the seawall and construction of the marina have the potential to cause damage to the Warner Avenue Bridge.

Groundborne vibration that could result in damage to structures would not be considered noise in the same way that groundborne noise and vibration affecting humans would. As such, impacts from groundborne vibration to structures would not be a construction activity that is exempt under the City's Noise Ordinance and would be potentially significant unless mitigated. To mitigate the potential risk of damage to the structures during construction activities involving shoring for the excavation of the lower garage level and the Impact Piers alternative for stabilizing the soil, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

NOISE-6: The applicant shall perform the following tasks:

- Conduct pre- and post-construction video and survey inspections of the Weatherly Bay Swimming Pool complex, Weatherly Bay tennis court, Weatherly Bay perimeter wall adjacent to the project site, and Warner Avenue Bridge.
- Install meters to measure and monitor vibrations.
- Visually monitor the above structures for damage on a daily basis, and video and survey once per week during construction.
- Upon evidence of structural damage to the above structures, the applicant shall cease construction operations immediately and assess, repair, and remediate any damages to the structures in accordance with the recommendations in the Preliminary Geology and Soils Report.

- Provide a bond in an amount determined by the City Engineer for the repair and/or replacement of structural damage to the Weatherly Bay Swimming Pool complex, Weatherly Bay tennis court, and Weatherly Bay perimeter wall adjacent to the project site.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce the potentially significant risk of structural damage to a less than significant level. It should be noted that if the Deep Soil Mixing alternative is the chosen method for stabilizing the soil and shoring the excavation of the subterranean garage, impacts to structures from groundborne vibration would not exceed the established thresholds and mitigation would not be required.

Installation of the seawall and construction of the marina docks would result in an exceedence of the established thresholds and potential impacts to the Warner Avenue Bridge. To mitigate the potential risk of damage to the Warner Avenue Bridge during installation of the seawall and construction of the marina docks, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

NOISE-7: The applicant shall perform the following tasks:

- Monitor ground vibrations near the wall to confirm safe operations of sheet-pile installation. Modify operations to keep vibrations within safe levels.
- Inspect the bridge and document the "as-is" condition by survey and video.
- During construction, continue to visually inspect the bridge and monitor changes and/or damage to the bridge by video and survey.
- Terminate the concrete sheet-pile wall, jet sheet piles within 16 feet of bridge and reduce energy of vibratory hammer. Prior to implementing this alternative, perform field measurements on sheet-pile installation to confirm that ground vibrations are within acceptable limits.
- In lieu of termination or jetting near the bridge, reinstall a 16-foot long revetted slope between the bridge and the sheet-pile wall.
- Install meters to measure vibration.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce the potentially significant risk of structural damage to a less than significant level.

Long-Term

The long-term operation of the 25-boat slip marina and 15 residential units are not expected to create excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. During the operation of the proposed project, the background operational vibration level would be expected to average around 50 VdB. This is substantially less than the vibration impact threshold of 85 VdB for human annoyance. No substantial sources of groundborne vibration would be built as part of the proposed project; therefore, operation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors on-site or off-site to excessive groundborne vibration levels. Less than significant impacts related to groundborne vibration resulting from the new development project are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 5, 30)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item X (a) above for long term noise impacts.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 5, 30)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item X (a) above.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 10, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos, but is not located within two miles of a public airport. No impacts are anticipated.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 10, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip that would expose residents and users of the proposed project to excessive noise levels. No impacts are anticipated.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Fire and emergency services to the project and vicinity are provided by the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department. Primary response services are provided by the Warner Station, Fire Station No. 5, located at 3831 Warner Avenue, approximately 330 ft. west of the project site. The proposed development can be adequately served by existing Fire protection service levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

Police services to the project site and vicinity are provided by the City of Huntington Beach Police Department. The closest police station is the Harbour Sub-Station at 16889 Algonquin Street, approximately 0.75 mile northeast of the project site. The proposed development can be adequately served by existing Police protection service levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The project site is located approximately 1.0 mile from the nearest elementary school (Harbour View) and will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts. Payment of school impact fees will be required to offset any additional increase in demand for services. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Parks? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The proposed project will not interfere with any parks, and the 25-boat slip marina will increase recreational boating opportunities within the Huntington Harbour area. The proposed project is not expected to have significant impacts to park facilities nor result in a significant demand on existing park facilities. The project is subject to City requirements to implement the provisions of the Quimby Act related to the dedication of land for park and recreational facilities or payment of in-lieu fees. The proposed project is required to pay park fees (in accordance with Chapter 254 of the HBZSO) to offset any additional increase in demand for services. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1, 29) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The Huntington Harbour Main Channel surrounds the land portion of the subject site to the north and the west. The portion of the Main Channel to the west is used by the City of Huntington Beach Marine Safety Division on a regular basis to gain access to the open waters for patrols and rescues and to secure rescue boats. Based on the Harmony Cove Navigation Channel Impact Review, prepared by Moffat & Nichol (February 2009), there is currently adequate maneuvering area for boats to navigate the channel with implementation of the proposed project. However, there is a staff recommended condition to provide a setback from the property line to provide adequate maneuvering area based on the future Marine Safety Division's needs and to accommodate the potential expansion of the docks on the west side of the channel. With compliance of standard code requirements and compliance with City conditions of approval and specifications, less than significant impacts to public facilities or governmental services are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 22) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

Based on the Sanitary Sewer Study, prepared by Nunez Engineering (December 2008), the proposed sewer flow at the project site will be approximately 3,805 gpd. The new wastewater discharges from the proposed project would place additional demand upon regional treatment facilities. The operational discharges of the proposed project will be sent

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

to the project's sewer system, which would ultimately be treated at one or more of the OCSD wastewater treatment plants. The OCSD wastewater treatment plants are required to comply with their associated waste discharge requirements (WDRs). WDRs set the level of pollutants allowable in water discharged from a facility.

Compliance with any applicable WDRs as monitored and enforced by the OCSD would ensure that the proposed project would not exceed the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Control Board with respect to discharges to the sewer system. This would result in a less than significant impact.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 22)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The project site is currently vacant. The project is not expected to result in the construction of new or significant expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. There are existing public water pipelines along Warner Avenue that could satisfy the demands of the project. A Utility Plan for new water service connections shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department. All utility connections to the project site will be in accordance with all applicable City standards. Wastewater services for the proposed project will be provided by an 8-inch sewer main located in the service road adjacent and parallel to Warner Avenue to the east of the project site, which is owned by the City of Huntington Beach. The 8-inch line connects to a 12-inch Vitreous Clay Pipe (VCP) sewer line in Warner Avenue that is owned by the City. The system connects to the sewer lift station #9 (D Station) at Edgewater and Warner, which is pumped to a 12-inch OCSD line in Marina View Place. A Sewer Study, prepared by Nunez Engineering (December 2008), found that the existing 12-inch sewer line is currently flowing over the allowable 50 percent design capacity or above 6 inches depth in the pipe, with an existing depth of flow in the pipe at 9.43 inches. The project will add a depth of flow of 0.03 inches to the system, which will be addressed by payment of required connection fees. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The existing private storm drain, catch basin, and outlet structure shall be removed, resized, and reconstructed per a required Hydrology and Hydraulics Study. The required precise Grading Plan, Storm Drain Improvement Plan, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program will address the construction impacts of the replacement of the private storm water drainage facility. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 19)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The project site is currently vacant. Because the proposed project would result in an intensification of development on the project site, the project would result in an increase in water demand. The proposed project with a General Plan land use designation of RM (Residential Medium Density) would have a higher allocation of water usage than the existing land use designation of OS-P (Open Space-Park). The water usage allocations for the site are as follows: 5 acre feet per year for RM land use designation and 3 acre feet per year for OS-P land use designation. The difference in water usage allocation for the site is 2 acre feet per year. The total City usage is over 30,000 acre feet per year. Based on this information, the project would not result in a significant increase in water consumption that was not previously planned for the 2005 Water Master Plan and 2005 Urban Management Plan. The estimated project demand can be accommodated from the City's water supply and does not represent a significant impact.

The project is subject to compliance with the City's Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficiency Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which ensure water consumption is minimized.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project would generate approximately 3,805 gallons of wastewater per day. Sewage from the proposed project will be delivered to City-owned sewer lines that connect to the Orange County Sanitation District's trunk sewer lines. The wastewater generated from the proposed project would be treated by Orange County Sanitation District's Plants No. 1 and No. 2. The two plants have a treatment capacity of 276 mgd. Average daily flow to both plants combined is 243 mgd. These levels provide an additional capacity of 33 mgd for both Plants No. 1 and No. 2. The proposed project would generate negligible wastewater and would require the use of approximately 0.00156% of the remaining capacity of the OCSD's facilities; therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal. Collected solid waste is transported to a transfer station where the solid waste is sorted and processed through a Materials Recovery Facility where recyclable materials are removed. The remaining solid waste is transported to the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on present solid waste generation rates and the project's net increase of approximately 58,522 square feet of new floor area is not expected to generate a substantial amount of daily waste products in the long term based on the proposed use of a marina and 15 residential units. The project is not anticipated to noticeably impact the capacity of existing landfills that will serve the use.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion:

The project will be served by Rainbow Disposal and will be subject to participation in any solid waste reduction programs presently required in the City.

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1, 20, 21)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (e).

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, enhancing and preserving the aesthetic resources of the City, including natural area, beaches, bluffs, and significant public views is a City objective. The proposed project consists of development of a currently vacant parcel of land adjacent to a water channel of Huntington Harbour, one of the visual strengths of the community. However, scenic vistas in the City are primarily located along the coast. Since the site is located approximately 1,200 feet away from the ocean, views of the ocean are limited from this vantage point. Views of the coast, wetlands, bluff areas, and Harbour will be available along the public sidewalk adjacent to Warner Avenue and from some portions of the seven-foot public walkway adjacent to the marina. The site itself is not a scenic vista and development of the parcel will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The State of California Department of Transportation designates scenic highway corridors. The project site is not within a state scenic highway; nor is the project site visible from any (officially designated) scenic highway. In addition, as the project site is presently a vacant boat dock/parking facility, the site does not contain rock outcroppings or historic buildings. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed residential development and 25-boat slip marina will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. Single family dwellings and private boat docks are located to the north, east, and to a certain extent west of the property. Degradation of existing visual character or quality of the site would occur if the project introduces a new visible element that would be inconsistent with the overall quality, scale, and character of the surrounding development. Existing structures adjacent to the project site consist of two-story structures to the immediate east and north, two-story to three-story structures to the west, and four-story structures to the east (Bay Club). The application includes a variance in building height at 40 feet in lieu of the maximum allowed of 35 feet. The proposed three-story

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

structures at 40 feet would be consistent with the established development pattern in the area based on the surrounding buildings. In addition, the proposed project is subject to the City's urban design guidelines to ensure compatibility with the surroundings in terms of architectural quality and use of property. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The proposed project is located within a highly urbanized area. Because the project site is currently vacant, implementation of the proposed project would introduce new light sources within the vicinity and result in additional nighttime lighting and the potential for glare from the building, parking lot, and the increased number of vehicles and boat traffic on the project site. Although the project will result in changes to light in the area, the project's contribution to ambient lighting in the area is considered negligible. The project will be subject to standard code requirements, which require that lighting be directed to prevent spillage onto adjacent properties. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

The project site is located in Huntington Harbour, a man-made residential marina that was dredged out of mudflats in the early 1960's. In addition, the project site is previously graded and disturbed and does not have any existing structures. Intact cultural, paleontological, archeological or historic resources are would not exist within the project site. The site is not located within the vicinity of any identified archaeological sites, paleontological sites, or cultural resources. No impacts are anticipated.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item XIV (a) above.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item XIV (a) above.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item XIV (a) above.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

The project includes 15 residential units and a 25-boat slip marina. The residential units will not generate significant demand for or use of neighborhood, community, or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The new marina will enhance the public's use of recreational resources in the Harbour but will not cause significant deterioration of the facilities. Moreover, the project will be subject to payment of the City's park fee pursuant to the HBZSO. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

In accordance with the Open Space – Water Recreation zoning designation on the submerged portion of the site, the developer proposes to construct a 25-boat slip marina with floating docks and a floating pedestrian access ramp. The marina and boat slips will contribute to the recreational boating opportunities available in Huntington Harbour. The proposed facility is intended to provide dock space for a variety of boats and sizes. Furthermore, a seven-foot wide public easement for a sidewalk will be granted for ingress and egress to the proposed docks allowing public access to the waterfront.

As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality, Biological Resources, and Noise sections, construction of the marina and docks will result in impacts to water quality due to dredging, disturbance of sensitive species and habitat, and noise and vibration associated with pile driving activities. Although the project does have the potential for significant environmental impacts, the project design and recommended mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion

During construction of the marina's boat slips, there may be temporary disruptions to boat traffic within the channel. However, most of the construction activities will be staged from land and the width of the adjacent channel is wide enough to accommodate boats during the temporary construction process. There exists a Public Trust Easement over a portion of the project site that reserves the rights of the public to access navigable waters and to fish. Currently, there are no recreational opportunities on the land portion of the project site. The General Plan Amendment proposes to change the land use designation for the land portion of the project site from OS-P (Open Space-Park) to RM (Residential Medium Density) while the land use designation for the water portion remains the same. Although there is an existing dock, due to sedimentation, the channel adjacent to the project site is not navigable except by canoes or kayaks. The proposed 25-boat slip marina will provide additional recreational opportunities to complement other facilities in the Huntington Harbour area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 10) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item XVI (b) below.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion:

The land portion of the subject site is presently zoned RL-CZ (Residential Low Density—Coastal Zone) and is located in Huntington Harbour, a man-made residential marina complex developed in the 1960s. The water portion of the subject site is presently zoned OS-WR-CZ (Open Space—Water Recreation—Coastal Zone). The land portion of the site was previously used as a parking facility with a 35-space paved parking lot and the water portion of the site was used as public boat dock with a 6-foot long floating dock. There is no agriculturally zoned property in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Development of the site will not conflict with agricultural uses or zoning or convert farmland mapped by the California Resources Agency. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion:

This site is currently vacant but is surrounded by institutional and residential uses. No environmental changes associated with the proposed project would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impacts are anticipated.

XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 9) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion:

The proposed project would result in a total of approximately 4,322 tons of CO_2 emissions during construction. Post-construction CO_2 emissions would be approximately 714 tons/year. Therefore, the project would produce GHG emissions. Other GHG emissions could result from increases in electricity and natural gas usage and solid waste

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

production, all of which would occur with the proposed project. Although, the amount of post-construction GHG emissions from the project (714 tons/yr) represents a negligible percentage of the overall state of California GHG emissions (484,400,000 tons/yr - 2004), since there are no thresholds of significance established yet, any contribution of GHG emissions can be considered cumulatively significant.

The proposed project would incorporate design features that promote energy efficiency and a reduction in GHG emissions, both directly and indirectly. For instance, the project is proposing to utilize Energy Star-rated products in all of the units and drought tolerant landscaping is proposed. In addition, the project is required to comply with all applicable City codes and requirements pertaining to energy efficiency and water use efficiency as well as applicable requirements for construction equipment that would limit truck and equipment idling times, exhaust and dust. The identified project design features and applicable requirements are consistent with the GHG reduction strategies recommended by the California Climate Action Team (CCAT), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and the California Attorney General's office. Therefore, due to the project's small incremental contribution to GHG emissions in addition to reduction measures in the project's design, the project's incremental cumulative contribution would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 9)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

AB 32 codifies the state's goal to reduce its global warming by requiring that the state's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on greenhouse gas emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. In order to effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop appropriate regulations and establish a mandatory reporting system to track and monitor greenhouse gas emissions levels. In addition, the Natural Resources Agency recently adopted amendments to the CEQA guidelines (effective March 18, 2010) that require an evaluation and determination of the significance of a project's greenhouse gas emissions. The amendments require the lead agency to make a good faith effort in describing, calculating or estimating the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project using qualitative and/or quantitative analyses and methodologies. The proposed project's impacts on greenhouse gases emissions are described in item (a) above. Although there are no established thresholds of significance for this type of development, the project's small incremental contribution to GHG emissions would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy or regulation. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 3, 4, 24)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

The project site is currently a vacant boat dock/parking facility.

As discussed above in section IV. Hydrology and Water Quality, the project construction activities would have the potential to increase in water turbidity and degrade water quality for a short duration. Mitigation measures relative to

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

prevent and control turbidity shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

As discussed above in section VII. Biological Resources, the proposed project site contains some sensitive species that may be impacted as a result of the proposed project. Mitigation measures relative to the sensitive species are put in place shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

As discussed above in section XIV. Cultural Resources, the project site does not contain any historically aged structures or any unique archeological or paleontological resources.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1, 5, 10)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion:

As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, the project with implementation of standard code requirements and mitigation measures is anticipated to have less than significant impacts due to the small scale of the project and would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1, 5, 10)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion:

As discussed above in Section X. Noise, the project construction activities would have the potential to generate noise and groundborne vibration that impact sensitive receptors surrounding the project site. Mitigation measures relative to noise and groundborne vibration shall be implemented to reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

Reference #	Document Title	Available for Review at:
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	"
3	Project Vicinity Map	Attachment No. 1
4	Preliminary Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, Landscape Plan, Tentative Tract Map	Attachment No. 2
5	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
6	City of Huntington Beach Archaeological Site Vicinity Map	"
7	City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report	"
8	Revised FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map per LOMR (December 2009)	"
9	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	"
10	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	"
11	Trip Generation Handbook, 7th Edition, Institute of Traffic Engineers	"
12	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (October 2002)	"
13	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List	"
14	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	"

15	URBEMIS Air Quality Assessment (January 2010)	"
16	Preliminary Geology and Soils Prepared by Terra Costa Consulting Group, Inc. (January 2010)	"
17	Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Prepared by Cornerstone Technologies, Inc. (February 2006)	"
18	Limited Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment Prepared by Cornerstone Technologies, Inc. (February 2006)	"
19	2005 Urban Water Management Plan	"
20	Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan Prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates, Inc. (December 2009)	"
21	Hydrology Report Prepared by R.T. Quinn & Associates, Inc. (April 2009)	"
22	Sanitary Sewer Report Nunez Engineering (December 2008)	"
23	Trip Generation and Parking Analysis Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (August 2008)	"
24	Biological Assessment Prepared by MBC Applied Environmental Sciences (July 2009)	"
25	Biological Resources Survey Area	Attachment No. 3
26	Sediment Characterization Results Report BayviewHB Marina Maintenance Dredging Prepared by Anchor Environmental CA, L.P. (June 2008)	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
27	Analysis of Changes in Water Levels, Current Speeds, and Sedimentation Prepared by Everest International Consultants, Inc. (March 2009)	"
28	Dock Design Prepared by URS Cash & Associates (March 2009)	"
29	Harmony Cove Mitigation Channel Impact Review Prepared by Moffat and Nichol (February 2009)	"
30	Environmental Noise and Vibration Analysis Prepared by Gordon Bricken & Associates (December 2009)	"
31	Structures Sensitive to Groundborne Vibration	Attachment No. 4

32	City of Huntington Beach Emergency Management Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
33	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Attachment No. 5
34	Code Requirements Letter (April 2010)	Attachment No. 6